Remarks:

Reconsideration of the above referenced application in view of the enclosed amendment and remarks is requested. Claims 31-33 are added to recite additional embodiments disclosed the Specification as filed. Claims 1-6, 8-17 and 19-33 remain in the application.

ARGUMENT

Claims 1-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,178,443 to Lin (hereinafter, "Lin"). This rejection is respectfully traversed and Claims 1-29 are believed allowable based on the above amendments and following discussion.

With regards to Claim 1, the Examiner asserts that Lin teaches *automatically creating a version of the profile for use on the second processor-based system.* The Examiner cites Col. 2, lines 53-61 which describes that:

> "Where repository computer 1 includes, for example, a Windows™3.n/95 operating system, server-side synchronization agent 6 may be implemented as a dynamic link library (DLL) **invoked automatically at startup**. Similarly, in a DOS environment, server-side synchronization agent 6 may be an **executable program initiated by the AUTOEXEC.BAT file.** Other implementations are also possible, depending upon the characteristics of the particular operating environment of repository computer 1." [Emphasis added]

While Lin teaches that the server-side synchronization agent may be loaded at startup or "invoked automatically at startup" (Office Action, page 3), Lin does not teach that the synchronization performs any action automatically. In comparison, many programs are invoked by BIOS or an operating system at boot or startup. These programs may remain memory resident or be awakened by an interrupt. However, just because a program is memory resident or loaded into memory, that program does not necessarily perform any actions or functions until some trigger activates the action. Lin teaches a system where the synchronization agent may be loaded at startup in a variety of ways.

However, Lin teaches away from Applicant's claimed invention. Instead of teaching a system *automatically creating a version of the profile for use on the second processor-based*

system, Lin teaches that server-side synchronization is "activated upon receipt of a service request." (Col. 3, lines 29-39) Until such a request is received by the server, the profiles are not created or updated on the server system. In contrast, Applicant's claimed invention requires that the profile is *automatically created* to be used on the portable (second processor-based system). Lin does not teach or suggest that synchronization is automatic, but only that the agent is "automatically" launched. This distinction is important. Lin fails to teach all of the elements of Applicant's claimed invention. Thus, independent Claim 1 and its progeny are believed allowable.

With regard to Claim 2, Applicant's recited claim requires *automatically creating a version of the profile in response to the user logging on to the first processor-based system.* First, Lin teaches synchronization of the profiles only in response to a service request, not directly in response to an event. Second, at no time does Lin teach that the user may log on to the first processor-based system, or server. Lin teaches only that the user logs on to the local computer, or client-side system (second processor-based system). The Examiner likens startup to logging on. It will be apparent to one of skill in the art that a computer system may be booted up, an operating system may be launched, and yet, no user has logged on to the system. The term "user logging on" has clear meaning in the art. Most frequently, logging on requires entry of a username and password. Applicant's invention is directed toward user profiles. Thus, it will be understood that logging on at least requires an identification of the user, even if a password is not required. Lin teaches only starting the repository computer. As the server system, the repository may never be accessed by a user, only administrators. Further, starting it up does not equate to a user logging on. Thus, Lin fails to teach or suggest the precise limitations of Claim 2, and Claim 2 is believed allowable.

Similar to Claim 1, Claim 3 requires *automatically creating a version of the profile for use on a portable processor-based system.* Lin teaches that profiles are created only after receiving a service request and thus, are not automatically generated. Therefore, Claim 3 is believed allowable.

Claims 4-5 are believed allowable, at least, as being dependent on an allowable base claim.

Claim 6 requires *automatically forwarding the profile from the second processor-based system to the first processor-based system before powering down the second processor-based system*. Lin teaches forwarding an updated profile only upon logging off of the client-side system. It will be understood by one of skill in the art that logging off of a system is not the same as powering the system down. A user may log off, and a second user may log on, etc., without ever powering the system down. In this case, several new or updated user profiles may be maintained on the second-processor based system until the system is powered down, when the profiles are then *automatically* forwarded. This, the claimed invention clearly enables functionality that is not taught or suggested by Lin. Lin suggests only that certain events occur when powering up either the repository or local computer, but never teaches or suggests an activity upon powering down the local, or client-side, computer. Thus, Claim 6 and it progeny are believed allowable. Claims 8-11 are believed allowable as being based on an allowable base claim.

Specifically with regard to Claim 9, Lin fails to teach or suggest that the second processor-based system (client system) *automatically receiving the user profile from a first processor-based system.* Lin teaches that the repository computer (first processor-based system) synchronizes the profiles only in response to a service request, and is not automatic. The cited reference teaches that the client-side agent "tries" to retrieve the most current user preference information. It will be apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art that pro-actively retrieving by the client-side is not the same as the server-side sending the user profile and the client-side *automatically receiving* the user profile. Thus, Lin fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Applicant's claimed invention and Claim 9 is believed allowable.

Specifically with regard to Claim 10, Applicant's recited claim requires *automatically receiving the profile from the first processor-based system in response to a log on to the first processor-based system.* First, Lin teaches synchronization of the profiles only in response to a service request, not directly in response to a log on event. Second, at no time does Lin teach that the user may log on to the first processor-based system, or server. Lin teaches only that the user logs on to the local computer, or client-side system (second processor-based system). Thus, Lin fails to teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 10, and Claim 10 is believed allowable.

With regard to Claim 11, Lin does not teach or suggest that a profile is automatically transmitted in response to a command to power down the second processor-based system. Lin teaches forwarding an updated profile only upon logging off of the client-side system. Logging off of a system is not the same as powering the system down, as discussed above. A user may log off, and a second user may log on, etc., without ever powering the system down. Lin teaches that certain events occur when powering up either the repository or local computer, but never teaches or suggests an activity upon a command to power down the local, or client-side, computer.

Claim 12 is similar in scope to Claim 1 and is believed allowable based on the discussion above.

Claim 13 is similar in scope to Claim 2 and is believed allowable based on the discussion above.

With regard to Claim 14, Applicant's claimed invention requires instructions to *automatically create a version of a web browser profile in response to the user logging on to the processor-based system through the second processor-based system*. At no time does Lin teach or suggest that the user logs on to the repository system by logging on to the client system. Further, the cited reference (Col. 4, lines 60-64) fails to teach the recited limitations. At Col. 4, lines 60-64, Lin teaches that the client-side synchronization "tries to retrieve" the most current user preference. A pro-active attempt at trying to retrieve is not the same as automatically receiving. Thus, Lin fails to teach or suggest the recited limitations, and Claim 14 is believed allowable.

Claims 13-16 are believed allowable as being based on an allowable base claim.

The rationale for allowing Claim 17 is similar to Claim 6. Lin does not teach or suggest to *automatically forward the profile before powering down the second processor-based system.* Thus, Claim 17 and its progeny (Claims 19-22) are believed allowable.

With regard to Claim 23, Applicant's claimed invention requires the processor to *automatically provide the web browser profile for a user to a second processor-based system.* In contrast, the cited reference (Col. 4, lines 60-67) of Lin teach that the client-side system "tries to retrieve the most current user preference." *Trying to retrieve* is not the same as being *automatically forwarded* a user preference, or web browser profile. Lin does not teach or suggest

that the repository computer automatically forwards the user preference, but only reacts to a service request. Thus, Lin fails to teach or suggest all recited limitations of Applicant's claims, and Claim 23 and its progeny (Claim 24) are believed allowable.

Similarly, with regard to Claim 25, Lin fails to teach or suggest a processor to *automatically forward the updated profile to a second processor-based system.* As discussed above, Lin does not teach or suggest that the repository computer automatically forwards the updated profile, but only reacts to a service request. Thus, Lin fails to teach or suggest all recited limitations of Applicant's claims, and Claim 25 and its progeny (Claims 26-29) are believed allowable.

All claims remaining in the application are now allowable.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Claims 1-6, 8-17 and 19-33 are all in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 633-6845. Early issuance of Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Please charge any shortage of fees in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 02-2666 and please credit any excess fees to such account.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 16 Nov. 2005

s / *Joni D. Stutman-Horn* /

Joni D. Stutman-Horn
Patent Attorney
Intel Corporation
Registration No. 42,173
(703) 633-6845

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Blvd.
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030